

EXHIBIT B

The Electoral Effects of Ballot Design

An Executive Summary

Prepared by:

Joanne M. Miller
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science and International Relations
University of Delaware

June 21, 2020

Credentials

I am an Associate Professor at the University of Delaware, jointly appointed in the departments of Political Science & International Relations and of Psychological & Brain Sciences. Before moving to the University of Delaware in 2019 I was an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, and I retained courtesy appointments in the department of Psychology and the Hubbard School of Journalism and Mass Communication. I have taught undergraduate courses in quantitative methods, public opinion, political psychology, and media and politics, and graduate (PhD level) courses in survey questionnaire design, survey sampling methods, and political psychology. My positions at the Universities of Minnesota and Delaware have also involved mentoring and advising graduate student PhD dissertation projects. I received my PhD in Social Psychology from the Ohio State University in 2000, where I received extensive training in quantitative research methods and research design. I have authored or coauthored articles that have appeared in peer-reviewed academic journals such as *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, and *Political Psychology*. I have received multiple awards from the American Political Science Association for my work. My research has been funded by the National Science Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trusts, and I have served on the editorial boards of top journals in the discipline. I have authored or coauthored 80 research presentations at professional conferences, have given over 40 invited talks at colleges, universities, and to community organizations, and I was the keynote speaker for an EU-funded international academic conference. I am widely recognized—both nationally and internationally—as an expert in political psychology. My work has received significant coverage in national and international news outlets, and my candidate name order research has been cited in multiple court cases. I was elected to begin a 3-year term as Vice President for Publications of the International Society of Political Psychology in July 2020. My full curriculum vitae is appended to this report.

Overview

I have been retained to provide a report for litigation contesting the validity of New Jersey primary ballot design laws. In the pages that follow, I provide an Executive Summary of the social science research on the effects of candidate name order and other ballot design choices on election outcomes. I first review the empirical literature on name order effects. I conclude that:

1. Candidate name order effects have been extensively studied, in both general and primary elections. The empirical evidence overwhelmingly finds that there is a systematic “first position” vote advantage, and that this advantage is due solely to name order. Candidates receive more votes when they are listed first on the ballot than when they are listed in other positions.
2. This systematic first position bias can be large enough to affect the outcome of elections (especially close ones).
3. Candidate name order primacy effects on vote choice are at least as large, and in some cases larger, in primary elections compared to general elections.

4. Primacy effects are stronger when voters have less information about candidates, such as in low visibility and non-partisan races.

Next, I review select literature on the effect of other ballot design choices on election outcomes. I conclude that:

1. Seemingly innocuous ballot design choices can “nudge” voters toward or against particular candidates, or can have a systematic effect on undervotes, overvotes, “proximity-mistake” votes, and ballot-flaw-induced votes that can disenfranchise a substantial number of voters.
2. Poor ballot design can affect the outcome of elections.

I then briefly discuss the implications of the scholarly literature on the effects of candidate name order and other ballot design features for the New Jersey Democratic primary ballot. I conclude that:

1. Given the consistency of the evidence of primacy effects from different scholars and across different states, years, and races, it is extremely likely that primacy effects have occurred and will occur in the New Jersey primaries. Candidates in New Jersey primaries who are listed first have a distinct advantage owing solely to name order, and candidates who never have a chance to be listed in the first position are systematically disadvantaged.
2. Other design features of the New Jersey primary ballot, such as:
 - a. the placement of a candidate far away from other candidates in the same race (separated by multiple blank columns);
 - b. the visual cue of one “full” column of candidates in comparison to sparse columns;
 - c. the inclusion of superfluous information such as column labels;
 - d. the arbitrary grouping of candidates for different races in the same column; and
 - e. having a “lone wolf” candidate in his/her own column

are likely to have the effect of “nudging” voters toward specific candidates, and/or to induce other systematic biases (such as undervotes, overvotes, and ballot-flaw-induced votes) that disenfranchise voters.

3. Candidate name order primacy effects in New Jersey primaries are likely exacerbated by these other ballot design features of the New Jersey primary ballot.

Effects of Candidate Name Order

Theory

In our manuscript published in *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Stanford Professor Jon Krosnick and I (Miller and Krosnick 1998) argue that the order in which candidates' names appear on a ballot will have an impact on their vote percentage (see also, Pasek et al. 2014):

“One psychological theory of order effects predicts ‘primacy effects’, which are biases toward selecting the first object considered in a set. People tend to evaluate objects with a confirmatory bias. Specifically, people usually begin a search of memory for information about an object by looking for reasons to select answer choices, rather than reasons not to select them. So when considering a list of political candidates, voters probably search memory primarily for reasons to vote for each contender rather than reasons to vote against him or her. And when working through a list, people think less and less about each subsequent alternative, because they become increasingly fatigued, and short-term memory becomes increasingly clogged with thoughts. Therefore, people may be more likely to generate supportive thoughts about candidates listed initially and less likely to do so for later-listed candidates, biasing them toward voting for the former. This theory is consistent with dozens of experiments that presented objects visually and nearly always found bias toward selecting initially-offered options... Name order might also influence the votes cast by people who have no information at all about the candidates in a race but nonetheless feel compelled to vote in all races in order to be ‘good citizens.’ According to Simon’s (1957) notion of satisficing, people are inclined to settle for the first acceptable solution to a problem they confront, especially when the costs of making a mistake will be minimal. Therefore, if a citizen feels compelled to vote in races regarding which he or she has no substantive basis for choice at all, he or she may simply settle for the first name listed, because no reason is apparent suggesting that the candidate is unacceptable. Thus, there is abundant theoretical justification for the hypothesis that the order of candidates’ names on ballots may influence voters’ choices in some races. If people simply settle for the first listed contender when they have no information at all about a race, primacy effects will occur. Primacy effects would also be expected in races about which voters do have some information when they can generate at least some reasons to vote for each of the candidates. But when voters can only retrieve reasons to vote against competitors, recency effects would be expected” (pg. 293-295; citations omitted).

Research Method

The gold standard method for testing whether the order in which names on a ballot has an effect on election outcomes is to assign groups of voters different name orders, and calculate the percent of votes each candidate receives when they are listed in each position on the ballot (e.g., the percent of votes candidate A receives when listed first, when listed second, and so forth). Statistical tests are then conducted to determine whether any observed differences in those vote percentages are due to chance alone. If the null hypothesis (i.e. observed differences are due to

chance) can be rejected, then the difference in vote percentages can be attributed to name order (Johnson, Reynolds, and Mycoff 2020; Kellstedt and Whitten 2018).

A number of states in the U.S. assign groups of voters different name orders, and thus serve as “real life” laboratories to empirically test the impact of name order on election outcomes. The overwhelming conclusion from these studies is consistent with the psychological theory of primacy effects reviewed above. In sum, candidates receive more votes when they are listed first on the ballot, compared to when they are listed in other positions. These effects have been confirmed in general and primary elections, and are robust to various statistical specifications (see Beazley 2013 and Miller 2010 for reviews). Research also reveals the conditions under which such primacy effects are most likely to occur. In the sections that follow, I describe my own research that empirically demonstrates the primacy effect of candidate name order on election outcomes, and briefly review the broader literature that examines name order effects in the U.S.

Calculating the Size of Name Order Effects

The method(s) for calculating the size of name order effects varies depending on how many candidates are in the race. For 2-candidate races, the name order effect is simply the percentage of votes a candidate received when listed first minus the percentage of votes that same candidate received when listed second (i.e., last). Positive numbers indicate a primacy effect, such that the candidate listed first is advantaged; negative numbers indicate a recency effect, such that the candidate listed second is advantaged. Because the votes in 2-candidate races are reciprocal, calculating the effect of name order on the margin of victory is the difference between the additional votes *gained* by the candidate listed first and the additional votes *lost* by the candidate listed second. For example, take a race in which Candidate A is always listed first and both candidates receive 50% of the vote. If the name order effect in this race was 2% and Candidate B was always listed first on the ballot, Candidate B’s vote % would be 52% (50% *plus* the 2% advantage Candidate B receives due to now being listed first). Candidate A’s vote % would be 48% (50% *minus* the 2% disadvantage the candidate now receives solely due to now being listed second on all the ballots). As a general rule, in a 2-candidate race in which names are not rotated, if the candidate who is always listed first wins an election by a margin that is less than double the name order effect, name order can be said to have affected the outcome.

Calculating the size of the effect of name order in races with three or more candidates is less straightforward, because the first position advantage could “take votes away” from all the other candidates in the race or only some of them. In my research, I calculate the size of the name order effect in races with three or more candidates by subtracting the % of votes a candidate received when listed last from the % of votes the candidate receives when listed first. Alternative approaches include comparing the % of votes the candidate receives when listed first to an average of the % of votes the candidate receives in all other positions, or using linear effects models to estimate the predicted change in vote % when the candidate moves from one position on the ballot to the next.

Name Order Effects in General Elections

Along with Stanford Professor Jon Krosnick, I examined the effect of candidate name order on the 1992 election outcomes in the three biggest counties in Ohio – Cuyahoga, Franklin, and Hamilton (Miller and Krosnick 1998). Every Ohio county is required by law to implement a sequential rotation scheme to ensure that each candidate for each race on the general election ballot is listed in each position on the ballot in approximately an equal number of voting precincts. The basic procedure starts with a list of precincts in the county that is ordered based on the size of the precinct, the date it was created, and the letter of the first word of the precincts' names. Candidates for each race are listed in alphabetical order in precinct #1. For the second precinct, the candidate listed first in precinct 1 is moved to the bottom of the list, and so on. For example, in a 3-candidate race between Jones, Smith, and Thomas, the names are ordered: Jones, Smith, Thomas in precinct 1; Smith, Thomas, Jones in precinct 2; Thomas, Jones, Smith in precinct 3; Jones, Smith, Thomas in precinct 4, and so on. In this rotation scheme, each candidate is listed in each of the 3 positions in approximately 1/3 of the precincts (if the total number of precincts is not divisible by 3, one or two candidates will appear in the first position in 1 more precinct than the other(s)).

We tested whether name order affected the percentage of votes candidates received in 118 races that appeared on the ballots in the three counties, including races for U.S. President, U.S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives, State Representative, County Commissioner, Board of Elections, and Appeals Court Judge. Thirty-nine of the 96 2-candidate races we studied evidenced statistically significant primacy effects, ranging from .79% to 5.04% and averaging 2.74%. Only two races evidenced statistically significant recency effects (i.e., cases wherein candidates received more votes when listed last than when listed first; their magnitudes were .93% and 1.96%). Thirty-three of the 87 candidates in the races with more than 2 candidates evidenced statistically significant primacy effects (comparing first to last position), ranging from .06% to 6.27% and averaging 2.26%. There were no statistically significant recency effects. In sum, we found statistically significant name order effects for 48% of the candidates we examined; nearly all were in the direction of primacy. Across the 183 candidates we examined, candidates received an average of 2.33% more votes when listed first on the ballot than when listed last.

I have also studied the effect of name order in the 2000 general elections in Ohio, North Dakota, and California (North Dakota and California rotate names on the ballot in a similar procedure as Ohio; Krosnick, Miller, and Tichy 2004). Twenty-three percent of the 170 2-candidate races evidenced name order effects; all but two in the direction of primacy. In these 2-candidate races, the vote percentage difference between first and last (second) position ranged from 1.41% to 6.32%, and averaged 2.88%. Thirty-seven percent of the candidates in races with more than 2 candidates evidenced name order effects; three quarters of them were in the direction of primacy. The average magnitude of these primacy effects (comparing first to last position) was 1.36%.

My collaborators and I have also examined the effects of candidate name order in the races for President, Governor, U.S. Senate, and U.S. House of Representative races in 2012 and 2016 in New Hampshire, and again found primacy effects to be the rule (MacInnis, Miller, Krosnick, Below, and Lindner 2020). “Of the 33 candidates running in the 2012 and 2016 general

elections, 79% manifested name order differences in the direction of primacy... Among the differences in the direction of primacy, 38% were statistically significant or marginally statistically significant, ranging from less than .01 to 2.1 percentage points and averaging 1.1 percentage points” (pg. 14). First position placement even advantaged Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in the 2016 presidential election—the vote percentage difference for Donald Trump when he was listed first compared to last on the ballot was 1.7 (this effect was statistically significant); the first vs. last position difference for Hillary Clinton was 1.5 (this effect was marginally statistically significant).

The findings and conclusions from analyses of candidate name order effects in general elections from other scholars are consistent with those of my research. Ho and Imai (2006) studied the effect of name order in the 2003 California gubernatorial recall election, in which 135 candidates were listed on the ballot (name orders were rotated across assembly districts). Forty-one percent of the candidates evidenced statistically significant primacy effects, and 3% evidenced statistically significant recency effects (i.e., they received more votes when listed lower on the ballot).

Ho and Imai (2008) examined name order effects in the California general elections in between 1998 and 2000 (for President, U.S. Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Insurance Commissioner, Secretary of State, Treasurer, and Superintendent of Education), and found statistically significant primacy effects in 27 of the 68 races; additional results using a larger dataset of statewide races in California general elections going back to 1978 yielded similar findings.

Chen et al. (2014) analyzed 31 2-candidate statewide races in North Dakota between 2000 and 2006 (candidate name order was rotated by precinct). Eighty percent of the analyses were in the direction of primacy, and 9 were statistically significant. The average vote percentage advantage for first position was 1.17%, which is statistically significant from zero. Chen et al. (2014) found no effect of name order in the 3 races with more than 2 candidates, but noted that it is difficult to draw strong conclusions from such a small number of races.

Pasek et al. (2014) examined the effect of name order for 402 candidates running in 76 statewide elections in California between 1976 and 2006. Combining across the candidates, they report that the first position garnered statistically significantly more votes than other positions, a finding that was robust to various model specifications and statistical analysis procedures.

The only outlier is Alvarez et al. (2006), who reported a mixed pattern of name order effects than other scholars (12/52, or 23% of candidates in statewide races in California in 1998 evidenced statistically significant primacy effects in their analyses; 25% evidenced statistically significant recency effects). Pasek et al. (2014) argue that the Alvarez et al. (2006) anomalous findings (in comparison to the rest of the literature) are likely due to their use of lower-powered statistical tests, the uniqueness of the 1998 election context in California, and the fact that the authors analyzed data prepared by the California Secretary of State’s office that contained errors.

In addition to the research that examines the impact of ballot position in states in which candidates’ names are rotated on the ballot (thus enabling clearer inferences about the effect of

name order *per se* (Johnson, Reynolds, & Mycoff 2020; Kellstedt & Whitten 2018)), there is also evidence of a first position bias from analyses of races in which candidate name order was not rotated. Without rotation, these findings cannot be unambiguously attributed to ballot position. However, given the overwhelming consistency of the first position advantage demonstrated by different scholars, across different election years, races, and years, and that the findings are robust to alternative explanations and controls means that name order is the most likely cause.

Two studies examined California city council and school board elections in which the order of names on the ballot was determined by a random draw, so that specific characteristics of the candidates themselves do not affect ballot position. Meredith and Salant (2013) analyzed 7,846 such races between 1995 and 2008. They calculated the expected number of winners from each ballot position if name order did not matter, and compared that number to the actual number of winners from each ballot position. They concluded that the candidate listed first received 4-5% more votes than they would have been expected to receive if ballot position did not matter. “This estimate implies that the first listed candidate wins mostly one out of ten elections that he or she would otherwise lose” (pg. 177). Fillbrunn (2017) replicated these findings using 9,450 city council and school board elections in California from 1994 to 2012 using different estimation procedures, and found that “The first candidate on the list wins 7.40%... more elections than other ballot positions across all elections, which is a 13.0%... increase in winning chances.” Both findings were statistically significant.

Brockington (2003) studied whether candidates who were listed first on the ballot in general elections for city council in Peoria, Illinois between 1983 and 1999 received more votes than candidates listed in other positions (Peoria did not rotate names), and found that candidates received 5.2% less votes per position after first.

Finally, evidence of primacy effects has been obtained in analyses of general election races in which names were ordered alphabetically (Mueller 1970; Scott 1972; Stewart et al. 2008).

Name Order Effects in Primary Elections

Primacy effects are also the rule in primary elections. I and my colleagues (MacInnis, Miller, Krosnick, Below, and Lindner 2020) tested the impact of name order in the New Hampshire primaries in 2000, 2002, and 2004. Across the 51 candidates we studied, the average vote percentage advantage of being listed first compared to being listed last on the ballot was 1.85; Ninety percent of the candidates showed vote percentage differences in the direction of primacy. Among the 48% that were statistically or marginally statistically significant, the primacy effect ranged from a .3 to a 7.1 percentage points, for an average primacy effect advantage of 3.17. This primacy effect advantage across the 2000, 2002, and 2004 New Hampshire primaries is larger than the primacy effect we observed for the 2012 and 2016 New Hampshire general elections (see discussion above).

Grant (2017) analyzed the effect of name order in the Democratic and Republican primaries for all statewide races and one federal statewide (U.S. Senate) race in 2014 in Texas (where name order was randomized from county to county). All 24 contests evidenced statistically significant primacy effects, ranging from 1 to nearly 10 percentage points.

Koppell and Steen (2014) analyzed 79 races in the 1998 Democratic primary in New York City (where names were rotated by precinct). In 71 of the 79 races, candidates received more votes when listed first than in any other position (21 of the 79 analyses were statistically significant). The average first-position advantage was 3.4%. Moreover, the authors found that, “In 7 of the 79 contests, the first-position advantage *exceeded* [emphasis in original] the margin of victory... One of these elections was the hotly contested primary [between Melinda Katz and Anthony Weiner] to succeed Chuck Schumer in the House of Representatives” (pg. 276). In comparing their primacy effect results to my findings with Dr. Jon Krosnick (Miller and Krosnick 1998) on the first-position advantage in the 1992 general elections in the three largest counties in Ohio, Koppell and Steen (2014) conclude that: “the effect of name order on primary election outcomes is significantly larger than Miller and Krosnick’s estimate for general elections; furthermore, the magnitude of name-order effects is large enough to turn the outcome in some races. This phenomenon may not adversely affect any particular class of citizens, but it undermines equality among individual candidates. This is no less offensive to the democratic principle of fair play than, say, a state program that would provide a single candidate in each election contest—determined by lottery—with a cash grant.” (pg. 268).

Ho and Imai (2008) examined name order effects in the California primary and general elections in 1998 and 2000 (for President, U.S. Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Insurance Commissioner, Secretary of State, Treasurer, and Superintendent of Education). Of the 128 candidates in the primaries, 56% evidenced statistically significant primacy effects; the median effect was 1.6%. White (1950) reported a first position advantage in the 1948 Republican primary for Ohio Senate (where the two candidates’ names were rotated by precinct).

Edwards (2015a; 2015b) tested for name order effects in U.S. Senate and House elections between 1949 and 2012 and in state legislative elections between 1967 and 2012 by comparing states that used alphabetically ordered ballots to states that rotated or randomized candidate name order (over 87,000 races in total); he also found primacy effects to be the rule.

Brockington (2003) studied whether candidates who were listed first on the ballot in the primary elections for city council in Peoria, Illinois between 1983 and 1999 received more votes than candidates listed in other positions (Peoria did not rotate names), and found that candidates received 1.7% less votes per position after first. Without rotation, this decrease in vote percentage cannot be unambiguously attributed to ballot position. However, the effect was robust to alternative explanations and controls. Brooks (1921) reports a similar primacy effect in the race for national delegate at large in the Democratic primary in Pennsylvania in 1920, in which candidates’ names were listed in alphabetical order.

Moderators of Name Order Effects

In our study of the 1992 Ohio general elections (Miller & Krosnick 1998), we argue that name order effects would be larger in races about which voters had less information. Consistent with expectations, name order effects were larger for races that: 1) received less media coverage, 2) were non-partisan, and 3) did not involve incumbents. They were also stronger for races that had

a higher rolloff percentages (the proportion of voters who cast a ballot in the election but abstained from voting in that particular race), and for the county (of the three) in which residents were the least educated. Inconsistent with expectations, name order effects were smaller for races towards the end of the ballot.

Consistent with our finding (Miller & Krosnick 1998) that name order effects will be stronger among voters who have less information about the candidates (or for low-information races), Pasek et al. (2014) found that primacy effects were larger for low-visibility races, in years with higher turnout, in races that were not close, and in non-partisan races. Chen et al. (2014) found that primacy effects were larger for races in presidential election years, as well as in non-partisan, open seat, and low visibility races when examined separately. When all 4 variables were included in the same model, nonpartisan races and those held in presidential election years remained statistically significant, positive predictors of the size of the primacy effect (see also Meredith and Salant 2013; Scott 1972).

Effects of Other Ballot Design Choices

Theory

Candidate name order is not the only ballot design feature that can affect vote choice, although it is the one that has been the subject of the most empirical research. Other design choices, such as whether whether to include all candidates for a single race in one column or two (e.g., the “butterfly ballot”), whether voters are required to fill in a circle or connect an arrow on paper ballots, whether party symbols are used instead of party names, and confusing instructions (see Niemi & Herrnson 2003 for a review of the variation in ballot designs across the states and a discussion of some of the problems with individual state designs), can affect vote choice.

Beyond name order primacy effects, the design of the ballot can have a systematic effect on: 1) undervotes (the number of people who register a vote for some races on the ballot but not all of them; this is also called “rolloff”); 2) overvotes (the number of people who cast votes for more than the allowable number of candidates in a race, thus invalidating their vote), 3) “proximity-mistake” votes (accidentally voting for a candidate whose name appears next to the candidate for whom the voter wanted to cast a ballot), and ballot-flaw-induced votes (“miscalst votes caused by ballots with design flaws that predictably lead a percentage of voters to make certain categories of mistakes when voting” (Beazley 2013; pg. 21)).

One reason that seemingly innocuous ballot design features can affect vote choice and election outcomes is that, at the individual level, voting is a low-cost, low-benefit activity for most people (Aldrich 1993). As such, voters have incentives to use simplifying strategies to reduce the cognitive effort needed to cast their ballot, and are susceptible to subtle influences of even innocuous-seeming ballot design choices. The field of behavioral economics has identified a multitude of design features that can affect decisions of all kinds, such as how the layout of items on a restaurant menu can affect people’s choices. In their book, *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*, Thaler and Sunstein (2008) review the myriad ways “choice architects” take advantage of the cues and heuristics individuals use to make low-effort decisions to “nudge” people to make their desired choice (e.g., by manipulating the choice set or

by placing desired choice front-and-center in people’s visual fields). Other research on ballot design effects draws from work in survey methodology that finds that variations in survey question wording and question placement affect survey responses (e.g., Kimball and Kropf 2005). Given the wealth of evidence in psychology, survey research, and behavioral economics about the impact of design effects in a wide array of domains, Beazley (2013) argues that,

“When governments take on the responsibility of mandating a particular ballot and then designing that ballot, they become ‘choice architects,’ that is, they design the structures that people use to exercise a choice. In the case of elections, election administrators design—or choose the design of—the ballots that voters use to select the holders of dozens of national, state, county, and local offices. Because governments require voters to use a specific ballot to exercise their most fundamental right of citizenship, they have an obligation to ensure that the ballot does not needlessly interfere with the exercise of that right” (pg. 19).

In the remaining paragraphs, I summarize some of the empirical findings on the effect of other ballot design choices besides name order on vote choice and election outcomes. Although none of these studies speaks directly to the specific features of the New Jersey Democratic primary ballot, I conclude that design features that are unique to the New Jersey Democratic primary ballot are likely to lead to systematic biases in vote choice of the kind demonstrated in the literature on name order and other ballot design effects.

Research Findings

In their report, *Better Ballots*, Norden et al. (2008) examined how ballot design problems affected federal and state races between 2000 and 2008 by leading to an increase in “residual” or lost votes (either undervotes or overvotes). Overvotes are always due to voter error. Undervotes (i.e., not recording a vote in a particular race on the ballot, aka rolloff) could be due to voter error or a conscious choice by a voter to abstain from that race. In the absence of randomization of groups of voters to different ballot designs, it is difficult to discern whether any single instance of higher than usual residual votes are due to ballot design. But to the extent that a systematic increase in residual votes appears in conjunction with a particular ballot design across a large number of races and municipalities, ballot design is likely the culprit. The report goes on to argue that, “the strong correlation between flawed ballot design and instructions on the one hand, and high residual vote rates on the other, is difficult to deny. Invariably, when the authors and the Brennan Center Task Force on Ballot Design reviewed ballots in counties with unusually high residual vote rates, we found a poor design, poorly worded instructions, or (very often) both” (pg. 19).

The report identifies thirteen ballot design problems that were correlated with higher residual votes in counties that used those ballots, including: 1) splitting candidates for the same office onto two different columns (such as the infamous Palm Beach County “butterfly ballot”) or pages, 2) requiring voters to complete an arrow (in contrast to requiring them to fill in a bubble), and 3) leaving columns or rows for disqualified or withdrawn candidates on the ballot.

Based on their analysis, Norden et al. (2008) conclude that:

“Poor ballot design and instructions have led to the disenfranchisement of hundreds of thousands of voters in the last several federal elections. In nearly every election, we have seen ballot design mistakes repeated. There is compelling evidence that when basic usability principles are ignored in the design of ballots and drafting of instructions, a significant percentage of voters will be disenfranchised, and the affected voters will disproportionately be poor, minority, elderly and disabled voters” (pg. 13).

Kimball and Kropf (2005) examined the impact of a host of ballot design features on unrecorded votes for Governor in 250 counties in 5 states in 2002. In all 5 states, the gubernatorial race was the first-listed and arguably the most familiar race on the ballot. Although the number of unrecorded votes for top-of-the-ballot, prominent races is smaller than for other races on the ballot, the authors point to a CalTech/MIT Voting Technology Project report that found that roughly 1 in 50 voters failed to cast a ballot for President in the 2000 election. Kimball & Kropf (2005) examine the impact of an index of ballot design features such as: 1) requiring voters to “connect the arrow” instead of “fill in the bubble,” 2) listing candidates for the same race in more than one column or on more than one page, 3) designs that are ambiguous with regard to whether voters should mark the box/circle/arrow to the left or the right of the candidate’s name, 4) the presence of confusing instructions, and 5) cluttered ballots that include unnecessary information along with candidates’ names and parties. They found that the index was statistically significantly positively related to unrecorded votes, concluding that “ballot design can be an important factor in determining whether voters are able to cast a ballot accurately, which can influence the legitimacy of elections” (pg. 508).

The “butterfly ballot” that was used in the 2000 general election in Palm Beach County, Florida has also been the subject of both media and scholarly scrutiny. Rather than list all the presidential candidates in a single column, the butterfly ballot listed them in two columns, with “punch holes” between the two columns that alternated between candidates. To register a vote for the first candidate in the left column, voters needed to punch the first hole (George W. Bush was in this position on all ballots, because Florida does not rotate names, and gives the top spot in each race to the candidate who is of the same party as the current Governor). To register a vote for the second candidate in the left column, voters needed to punch the *third* hole (Al Gore was always listed in this position, because Florida law requires that the second-listed candidate be of the other major party). Voters who punched the second hole registered a vote for Pat Buchanan (who was always listed in the first position in the second column). This peculiar ballot design caused a great deal of confusion, and led to speculation that some number of voters in Palm Beach County who wanted to vote for Al Gore mistakenly punched the second hole (and thus voted for Buchanan), because Gore was the second candidate in the left-hand column. Wand et al. (2001) conducted an extensive empirical study of the impact of the butterfly ballot in Palm Beach County and concluded that the butterfly ballot was the source of anomalous support for Buchanan in Palm Beach County, stating: “with respect to the Reform vote in 2000, Palm Beach County is the largest outlier among all counties in the United States we were able to examine” (pg. 803). Their finding that the butterfly ballot was the cause of the large number of Buchanan votes was robust to a series of alternative explanations. Moreover, they found that the systematic voting errors that favored Buchanan caused at least 2,000 Democrats to mistakenly cast a vote

for Buchanan. This number of votes alone was the difference between Bush and Gore winning the presidency (see also Kimball & Kropf 2005).

Shue and Luttmer (2009) studied the impact of ballot design on “adjacency misvotes” (aka “proximity-mistake” votes), which occurs when a candidate receives more votes when they are listed in close proximity (next to or just above or below) a popular candidate. Using the 2003 California Gubernatorial recall election in which the order of candidates’ names were rotated across assembly districts, Shue and Luttmer (2009) found minor candidates’ vote shares close to doubled when listed adjacent to a major party candidate; this effect was statistically significant.

Augenblick and Nicholson (2016) examined vote returns for every federal, state, and local contest for every primary and general election between 1992 and 2002 in every San Diego, California precinct to test whether the position of the *race* on the ballot impacted the rolloff percentage for that race. California law requires some local races to appear on the ballot before other races. The number of local races from precinct to precinct varies, which means that some races appear closer to the top of the ballot in some precincts than they do in others. Augenblick and Nicholson (2016) summarized the results of their statistical analyses thusly: “across all contests in our data set, we find that lowering a given contest by one position on the ballot increases precinct-level undervotes by 0.11 percentage points” (pg. 462).

Implications for the New Jersey Democratic Primary Ballot

As Rubin (2020) documents, the New Jersey Democratic primary ballot is unique in a number of respects. One of the features unique to the New Jersey primary ballot is that it uses a format akin to the party column design (even though all the candidates running in each race are from the same party): “in all other states and DC, primary ballots are organized by the electoral position being sought, with candidates listed beneath each position... or immediately to the right of each position... These ballot designs make it easy for voters to identify which candidates are running for which electoral office. By contrast, in nineteen of New Jersey’s twenty-one counties, primary ballots are organized around a slate of candidates endorsed by either the Democratic or the Republican Party. These slates of candidates are known as the ‘county line,’ in reference to the fact that the endorsements are determined at the county party level and the endorsed candidates are presented on the ballot as a vertical or horizontal line of names” (Rubin 2020, pg. 1-2; see also Rubin 2020 for a link that includes recent sample ballots for all 50 states and the District of Columbia). The “county line” is also given one of the top positions on the ballot (the order of names is not rotated). Oftentimes, a candidate who is not on the “county line” can be placed in a column far away from the other candidates in the same race, with a series of blank columns in between them and the county-endorsed column, which typically has a candidate running in every race.

As reviewed above, the scholarly literature overwhelmingly concludes that candidates receive systematically more votes when they are listed first on the ballot. Given the consistency of the evidence of primacy effects from different scholars and across different states, years, and races, it is extremely likely that primacy effects have occurred and will occur in the New Jersey primaries. Candidates in New Jersey primaries who never have a chance to be listed in the first position are systematically disadvantaged.

Moreover, although the unique features of the New Jersey primary ballot have not been the subject of empirical analyses, given the evidence of the effects of confusing ballot designs on overvotes, undervotes, and mistaken votes reviewed above (e.g., Kimball and Kroft 2005; Norden et al. 2008; Wand et al. 2001), I conclude that New Jersey Democratic primary ballot design features such as:

- a. the placement of a candidate far away from other candidates in the same race (separated by multiple blank columns);
- b. the visual cue of one “full” column of candidates in comparison to sparse columns;
- c. the inclusion of superfluous information such as column labels;
- d. the arbitrary grouping of candidates for different races in the same column; and
- e. having a “lone wolf” candidate in his/her own column

are likely to have similar types of systematic effects.

References

- Aldrich, John H. 1993. "Rational Choice and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science*, 37:246-78.
- Alvarez, R. Michael, Betsy Sinclair, & Richard L. Hasen. 2006. "How Much is Enough? The 'Ballot Order Effect' and the Use of Social Science Research in Election Law Disputes." *Election Law Journal* 5:40-56.
- Augenblick, Ned & Scott Nicholson. 2016. "Ballot Position, Choice Fatigue, and Voter Behaviour." *Review of Economic Studies* 83:460–80
- Beazley, Mary Beth. 2013. "Ballot Design as Fail-Safe: An Ounce of Rotation is Worth a Pound of Litigation." Scholarly Works. 1069.
<http://scholars.law.unlv.edu/facpub/1069> (accessed June 4, 2020).
- Brockington, David. 2003. "A Low Information Theory of Ballot Position Effect." *Political Behavior* 25(1):1–27.
- Brooks, Robert C. 1921. "Voters' Vagaries." *National Municipal Review* 10:161-5.
- Chen, Eric, Gábor Simonovits, Jon A. Krosnick, & Josh Pasek. 2014. "The Impact of Candidate Name Order on Election Outcomes in North Dakota." *Electoral Studies* 35: 115-22.
- Edwards, Barry C. 2015a. "Alphabetically Ordered Ballots and the Composition of American Legislatures." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 15(2): 171-19.
- Edwards, Barry C. 2015b. "Alphabetically Ordered Ballots Make Elections Less Fair and Distort the Composition of Legislatures." Available from
<http://www.democraticaudit.com/2015/06/16/alphabetically-ordered-ballots-make->
 (accessed June 1, 2020).
- Fillbrunn, Mirko. 2017. "Strategic Voting and Ballot Order Effects." Unpublished Manuscript. Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA.
<http://people.bu.edu/mfi/papers/MFillbrunnStrVoting.pdf> (accessed June 1, 2020).
- Grant, Darren. 2017. "The Ballot Order Effect is Huge: Evidence from Texas." *Public Choice* 172:421-42.
- Ho, Daniel E., Kosuke Imai. 2006. "Randomization Inference with Natural Experiments: An Analysis of Ballot Effects in the 2003 California Recall Election." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 101:888-900.
- Ho, Daniel E., and Kosuke Imai. 2008. "Estimating Causal Effects of Ballot Order from a Randomized Natural Experiment: The California Alphabet Lottery, 1978-2002." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72(2):216-40.

- Johnson, Janet Buttolph, H. T. Reynolds, & Jason D. Mycoff. 2020. *Political Science Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press.
- Kellstedt, Paul M. & Guy D. Whitten. 2018. *Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Koppell, Jonathan, & Jennifer A. Steen. 2004. “The Effects of Ballot Position on Election Outcomes.” *Journal of Politics* 66(1):267–81.
- Krosnick, Jon A., Joanne M. Miller, & Michael P. Tichy. 2004. “An Unrecognized Need for Ballot Reform: The Effects of Candidate Name Order on Election Outcomes.” In: *Rethinking the Vote: The Politics and Prospects of American Election Reform*, edited by Edward J. McCaffery, 51–74. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- MacInnis, Bo, Joanne M. Miller, Jon A. Krosnick, Clifton Below, & Miriam Lindner. 2020. “Candidate Name Order Effects in New Hampshire: Evidence from Primaries and from General Elections with Party Column Ballots.” Unpublished Manuscript. <https://pprg.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/New-Hampshire-Ballot-Order.pdf> (accessed June 1, 2020).
- Meredith, Marc & Yuval Salant. 2013. “On the Causes and Consequences of Ballot Order Effects.” *Political Behavior* 35:175–197.
- Miller, Joanne M., & Jon A. Krosnick. 1998. “The Impact of Candidate Name Order on Election Outcomes.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62(3):291–330.
- Miller, Laura. 2010. Election by Lottery: Ballot Order, Equal Protection, and the Irrational Voter. *Legislation and Public Policy* 13:373-405.
- Mueller, John E. 1970. “Choosing Among 133 Candidates.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 34:395-402.
- Niemi, Richard G. & Paul S. Herrnson. 2003. “Beyond the Butterfly: The Complexity of U.S. Ballots” *Perspectives on Politics* 1(2):317-324.
- Norden, Lawrence, David Kimball, Whitney Quesenbery, and Margaret Chen. 2008. *Better Ballots*. Brennan Center for Justice, *New York University School of Law*. <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/better-ballots> (accessed June 2, 2020).
- Pasek, Josh, Daniel Schneider, Jon A. Krosnick, Alexander Tahk, Eyal Ophir, & Claire Milligan. 2014. “Prevalence and Moderators of the Candidate Name-Order Effect: Evidence from Statewide General Elections in California.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(2):416–39.

- Rubin, Julia Sass. 2020. "New Jersey's Primary Ballot Design Enables Party Insiders to Pick Winners." Unpublished Manuscript. <https://doi.org/doi:10.7282/t3-31dy-0j57> (accessed June 2, 2020).
- Scott, W. James Jr. 1972. "California Ballot Position Statutes: An Unconstitutional Advantage to Incumbents." *Southern California Law Review* 45(1):365-95.
- Simon, Herbert. 1957. *Models of Man*. New York: Wiley.
- Shue, Kelly & Erzo F. P. Luttmer. 2009. "Who Misvotes? The Effect of Differential Cognition Costs on Electoral Outcomes." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 1(1): 229-57.
- Simon, Herbert. 1957. *Models of Man*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Stewart, Derek, Ben Khan, & Kensington Moore. 2008. "Ballot Order Effect." Unpublished Manuscript. Burlington, VT: Vermont Legislative Research Shop, University of Vermont. <https://www.uvm.edu/~vlrs/PoliticalProcess/ballotordereffects.pdf> (accessed June 1, 2020).
- Thaler, Richard H., and Cass R. Sunstein. 2008. *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Wand Jonathan N., Kenneth W. Shotts, Jasjeet S. Sekhon, Walter R. Mebane, Jr., Michael C. Herron, and Henry E. Brady. 2001. "The Butterfly Did It: The Aberrant Vote for Buchanan in Palm Beach County, Florida." *American Journal of Political Science* 95(4): 793-810
- White, Howard. 1950. "Voters Plump for First on List." *National Municipal Review*, 39:110-1.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Joanne M. Miller

University of Delaware, Department of Political Science and International Relations
jomiller@udel.edu

EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND APPOINTMENTS

Education

Ph.D., Psychology, Ohio State University, February, 2000

Minors: Political Psychology and Quantitative Methods

M.A., Psychology, Ohio State University, 1995

B.A., Psychology & Political Science, University of Richmond, 1991, *Magna Cum Laude*

Academic Positions

2019-present Associate Professor of Political Science and International Relations and Associate Professor of Psychology and Brain Sciences, University of Delaware

2007-2018 Associate Professor of Political Science, Affiliate Associate Professor of Psychology, and Affiliate Associate Professor of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Minnesota

2001-2007 Assistant Professor of Political Science & Adjunct Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Minnesota

2000-2001 Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Connecticut

Administrative Positions and Research Affiliations

2019-present Center for Political Communication, University of Delaware

2019-2020 PhD Admissions Director, Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Delaware

2016-2018 Placement Director, Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota

2011-2014 Director, Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota

2007-2010 Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota

- 2005-2008 Director of Graduate Studies, Graduate Minor in Political Psychology, University of Minnesota
- 2001-2018 Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota
- 2004-2018 Center for the Study of Politics and Governance, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota
- 2005-2018 Center for the Study of the Individual and Society, University of Minnesota

SCHOLARSHIP

Edited Volume

Borgida, Eugene, Christopher M. Federico, and Joanne M. Miller (Eds). 2020 *At the Forefront of Political Psychology: Essays in Honor of John L. Sullivan*. New York: Routledge.

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles and Book Chapters

Miller, Joanne M. “Psychological and Situational Factors Combine to Boost COVID-19 Conspiracy Theory Beliefs.” Manuscript accepted. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* (special call for COVID-related articles). Online first view: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000842392000058X>

Peterson, David A. M., Joanne M. Miller, Kyle L. Saunders, and Scott D. McClurg. 2020. “Macrointerest.” Manuscript accepted. *British Journal of Political Science*. **NOTE:** A previous version of this manuscript was the recipient of the *Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior Best Paper Award (2016)*, presented for the best EPOVB section paper delivered at the previous year’s APSA Annual Meeting.

Miller, Joanne M. 2020. “Do COVID-19 Conspiracy Theory Beliefs form a Monological Belief System?” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* (special call for COVID-related articles); Online first view: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423920000517>

Gollust, Sarah E. and Joanne M. Miller. 2019. “Framing the Opioid Crisis: Do Racial Frames Shape Beliefs of Whites Losing Ground?” *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 45(2): 241–276, doi: 10.1215/03616878-8004874

Sharro, Elizabeth A., Dara Z. Strolavitch, Michael T. Heaney, Seth E. Masket, and Joanne M. Miller. 2016. “Gender Attitudes, Gendered Partisanship: Feminism and Support for Sarah Palin and Hillary Clinton among Party Activists.” *Journal of Women, Politics, and Policy*. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 37:4, 394-416, doi: 10.1080/1554477X.2016.1223444.

Miller, Joanne M., Kyle L. Saunders, and Christina E. Farhart. 2016. “Conspiracy

Endorsement as Motivated Reasoning: The Moderating Roles of Political Knowledge and Trust.” *American Journal of Political Science* 60(4): 824-844. doi: 10.1111/ajps.12234.

NOTES: This manuscript was included in both the first and the second volumes of the *American Journal of Political Science's Top-Cited Virtual Issue* (March 28, 2018 and August 23, 2018); A previous version of this manuscript was the recipient of the *Paul Lazarsfeld Award (2015)*, presented for the best Political Communication paper delivered at the previous year’s APSA Annual Meeting.

Miller, Joanne M. and Kyle L. Saunders. 2016. “It's Not All About Resources: Explaining (or Not) the Instability of Individual-Level Political Participation.” *American Politics Review* 44(6) 943–981 doi: 10.1177/1532673X15599840.

Malhotra, Neil, Joanne M. Miller, and Justin Wedeking. 2014. “The Relationship Between Nonresponse Error and Measurement Error: Comparing an Online Panel Survey to Traditional Surveys,” in *Online Panel Research: A Data Quality Perspective* eds, Mario Callegaro, Reg Baker, Jelke Bethlehem, Anja S. Goritz, Jon A. Krosnick and Paul J. Lavrakas. NJ: Wiley Series on Survey Methodology (chapter proposal peer-reviewed by editors prior to acceptance).

Heaney, Michael T., Seth E. Masket, Joanne M. Miller, and Dara Z. Strolovitch. 2012. “Polarized Networks: The Organizational Affiliations of National Party Convention Delegates.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 56(12):1654-1676. **NOTE:** A previous version of this manuscript was the recipient of the *Political Organizations Best Paper Award (2010)*, awarded for the best paper delivered on a Political Organizations and Parties-sponsored panel at the 2009 APSA annual meeting.

Strolovitch, Dara Z., Joanne M. Miller, Michael T. Heaney, and Seth Masket. 2009. “A Tale of Two Cities: The 2008 National Party Conventions Study and the Politics of Protest.” *CURA Reporter* (a biannual peer-reviewed publication of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota).

Miller, Joanne M. 2007. “Examining the Mediators of Agenda Setting: A New Experimental Paradigm Reveals the Role of Emotions.” *Political Psychology* 28(6): 689-717.

Donahue, Amy K. and Joanne M. Miller. 2006. “Experience, Attitudes, and Willingness to Pay for Police and Fire Protection.” *American Review of Public Administration* 36: 395-418. **NOTE:** *Winner, Best Article Award, for the best article published in the journal in 2006.*

Donohue, Amy K. and Joanne M. Miller. 2005. “Citizen Preferences and Paying for Municipal Police.” *Journal of Urban Affairs* 27: 419-435.

Miller, Joanne M. and David A. M. Peterson. 2004. “Theoretical and Empirical Implications of Attitude Strength.” *Journal of Politics* 66: 847-867.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 2004. "Threat as a Motivator of Political Activism: A Field Experiment." *Political Psychology* 25: 507-524.

Luks, Samantha, Joanne M. Miller, and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2003. "Who Wins? Campaigns and the Third Party Vote." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 33: 9-30.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 2000. "News Media Impact on the Ingredients of Presidential Evaluations: Politically Knowledgeable Citizens are Guided by a Trusted Source." *American Journal of Political Science* 44: 295-309.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1998. "The Impact of Candidate Name Order on Election Outcomes." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62: 291-330.

Chapters in Edited Volumes

Farhart, Christina E., Joanne M. Miller, and Kyle L. Saunders. "Conspiracy Stress or Relief? Learned Helplessness and Conspiratorial Thinking." (In Press). *The Politics of Truth in Polarized America*, ed. David Barker and Elizabeth Suhay, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, Joanne M, Jon A. Krosnick, Allyson Holbrook, Alexander Tahk, and Laura Dionne. 2017. "The Impact of Policy Change Threat on Financial Contributions to Interest Groups." In *Political Psychology: New Explorations*, ed. Jon A. Krosnick, I-Chant A. Chiang, and Tobias H. Stark. Routledge: New York, NY.

Miller, Joanne M, Jon A. Krosnick, and Leandre R. Fabrigar. 2017. "The Origins of Policy Issue Salience: Personal and National Importance Impact on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Emotional Issue Engagement." In *Political Psychology; New Explorations*, ed. Jon A. Krosnick, I-Chant A. Chiang, and Tobias H. Stark. Routledge: New York, NY.

Miller, Joanne M. 2013. "The Motivational Underpinnings of Political Participation." In *New Directions in American Politics*, ed. Raymond J. La Raja. Routledge: New York, NY.

Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Joanne M. Miller. 2007. "Bucking the Democratic Sweep in Minnesota: Campaigning in a Hostile Environment and Winning." In *The Sixth Year Itch: The Rise and Fall of the George W. Bush Presidency*, ed. Larry J. Sabato. Longman: New York, NY.

Flanigan, William H., Joanne M. Miller, Jennifer L. Williams, and Nancy H. Zingale. 2004. "From Intensity to Tragedy: The 2002 Minnesota Senate Race." In *The Last Hurrah? Soft Money and Issue Advocacy in the 2002 Congressional Elections*, ed. David B. Magelby and J. Quin Monson. Brookings Institution Press: Washington, D.C.

Krosnick, Jon A., Joanne M. Miller, and Michael Tichy. 2004. "An Unrecognized Need for Ballot Reform: Effects of Candidate Name Order." In *Rethinking the Vote: The Politics and Prospects of American Election Reform*, ed. Ann N. Crigler, Marion R. Just, and Edward J. McCaffery. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Flanigan, William H., Joanne M. Miller, Jennifer L. Williams, and Nancy H. Zingale. 2004. "The Minnesota Senate and 2nd Congressional District Races." In *The Last Hurrah? Soft Money and Issue Advocacy in the 2002 Congressional Elections*, ed. David B. Magelby and J. Quin Monson. Brookings Institution Press: Washington, D.C.

Flanigan, William H., Joanne M. Miller, Jennifer L. Williams, and Nancy H. Zingale. 2003. "The Minnesota Senate and 2nd Congressional District Races." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 36(3): E-symposium.

Anglund, Sandra M. and Joanne M. Miller. 2001. "The 2000 Connecticut Fifth Congressional District Race." In *Election Advocacy: Soft Money and Issue Advocacy in the 2000 Congressional Elections*, ed. David B. Magelby. Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy, Brigham Young University.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1997. "The Anatomy of News Media Priming." In *Do the Media Govern? Politicians, Voters, and Reporters in America*, ed. Shanto Iyengar and Richard Reeves. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1996. "News Media Impact on the Ingredients of Presidential Evaluations: A Program of Research on the Priming Hypothesis." In *Political Persuasion and Attitude Change*, ed. Diana C. Mutz, Paul M. Sniderman, and Richard A. Brody. University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, MI.

Edited Special Issue

Druckman, James N. and Joanne M. Miller. 2004. "The Political Psychology of Electoral Campaigns." *Political Psychology* 25: 501-610.

Book Reviews and Encyclopedia Entries

Miller, Joanne M. and Kyle L. Saunders. 2016. "Conspiracy Theories in the United States: More Commonplace than Extraordinary" [Book Review of *American Conspiracy Theories*, by Joseph E. Uscinski and Joseph M. Parent]. *Critical Review: A Journal of Politics and Society* 28(1): 127-136. doi: 10.1080/08913811.2016.1172802.

Parkin, Michael and Joanne M. Miller. 2005. "Partisanship Measurement." In *Polling America: An Encyclopedia of Public Opinion* (volume 2, pgs. 502-504), ed. Samuel J. Best and Benjamin Radcliff. Greenwood Press: Westport, CT.

Schneider, Monica C. and Joanne M. Miller. 2005. "Satisficing." In *Polling America: An Encyclopedia of Public Opinion* (volume 2, pgs. 728-732), ed. Samuel J. Best and Benjamin Radcliff. Greenwood Press: Westport, CT.

Other Works

Miller, Joanne M., Kyle L. Saunders, and Christina E. Farhart. "Why Donald Trump's election may mean we see more liberal conspiracy theories about the government." *USAPP – American Politics and Policy, London School of Economics* (December 7 2016).
<http://bit.ly/2h27gcZ>

Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Joanne M. Miller. "Ranked-choice voting: By the data, still flawed." Op-Ed, Star Tribune, (February 12, 2014).

Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Joanne M. Miller. "New Minneapolis voting rules could diminish equality." Op-Ed, Star Tribune (August 6, 2013).

Manuscripts Under Review

Farhart, Christina E., M. P. Hall, J. Kotcher, M. Levandusky, B. A. Lyons, J. M. Miller, B. Nyhan, K. T. Raimi, J. Reifler, K. L. Saunders, R. Sytte, X. Zhao. "Self-Affirmation and Identity-Driven Political Behavior: An Oversold Solution?" Manuscript under review.

Manuscripts In Preparation

Miller, Joanne M., Christina E. Farhart, and Kyle L. Saunders. "Are Conspiracy Theories for Losers? The Effect of Losing an Election on Conspiratorial Thinking."

Miller, Joanne M., Kyle L. Saunders, David A. M. Peterson, and Scott D. McClurg. "Putting the *Political* in Political Interest: The Conditional Effect of Politics on Citizen's Interest in Politics."

MacInnis, Bo, Joanne M. Miller, Jon A. Krosnick, Miriam Lindner, Clifton Below. "Ballot Order Effects in New Hampshire Randomizing Candidates' Names on the Ballot Reveals Broad Electoral Impacts."

Miller, Joanne M. “Conspiracy Theories.” For *Cambridge Handbook of Political Psychology*, ed. Danny Osborne and Chris Sibley (invited to contribute a chapter). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, Joanne M. and Dannagal G. Young. “Political Communication: Form and Consequence of the Information Environment.” For *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, ed. Leonie Huddy, David Sears, Jack Levy, and Jennifer Jerit (invited to contribute a chapter). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grants and Awards

National Science Foundation (\$38,250, funded by the RAPID program) for: “Influence on Beliefs in Non-Scientific Theories” (co-PI with David Peterson)
 University of Minnesota, Single Semester Leave (awarded for fall 2017)
 University of Minnesota, Outstanding Advising and Mentoring Award (2017; given by the Council of Graduate Students)
 University of Minnesota, Grant in Aid (\$36,000) for: “Are Conspiracy Theories for (Political) Losers?” (awarded in September 2016)
 University of Minnesota, Grand Challenges Exploratory Research Grant (\$55,000) for: “Understanding Barriers to Health Equity” (awarded in fall 2016 to Joanne M. Miller and Sarah Gollust, co-PIs)
 Best Paper Award (2016) for the best paper delivered on an Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior panel at the 2015 APSA annual meeting. Paper: “Macrointerest: The Public as Attentive Gods of Vengeance but Lazy Gods of Reward (with Apologies to V.O. Key)” (with David A. M. Peterson, Kyle L. Saunders, and Scott McClurg).
 Paul Lazarsfeld Award (2015) for the best paper delivered on a Political Communication panel at the 2014 APSA annual meeting. Paper: “Conspiracy Endorsement as Motivated Reasoning: The Moderating Roles of Political Knowledge and Trust” (with Kyle L. Saunders and Christina E. Farhart).
 Best Paper Award (2010) awarded for the best paper delivered on a Political Organizations and Parties-sponsored panel at the 2009 APSA annual meeting. Paper: “Networking the Parties: A Comparative Study of Democratic and Republican National Convention Delegates in 2008” (with Michael T. Heaney, Seth E. Masket, and Dara Z. Strolovitch).
 University of Minnesota, Single Semester Leave (awarded for fall 2010; declined).
 University of Minnesota, Sabbatical Supplement (awarded for 2010-2011).
 Pew Charitable Trusts, planning grant for: “Evaluation of Minnesota Secretary of State Automatic Voter Registration Updating Program” (Lawrence R. Jacobs and Joanne M. Miller, co-PIs), 2009.
 National Science Foundation SGER (\$32,500, funded by Political Science) for: “Healing the Rifts: A Study of Intraparty Factionalism at the Presidential Nominating Conventions” (Michael T. Heaney, Seth E. Masket, Joanne M. Miller, Dara Z. Strolovitch, co-PIs), Sept 2008-Jan. 2010.

National Science Foundation (\$287,483, jointly funded by Political Science and Social Psychology Programs) for: “An Experimental Test of the Role of Motives in Predicting Political Participation” (Joanne M. Miller, PI), Feb. 2007-Sept. 2009.

Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota (\$5,000) for: “Embodied Politics: Partisans, Protesters, and the 2008 National Party Conventions” (Joanne M. Miller and Dara Z. Strolovitch, co-PIs), Sept. 2008-Sept. 2009.

Office of the Vice President for Research, University of Minnesota (\$15,000) for: “Translating Theory and Research on Civic Participation to Create Vibrant Communities for an Urban Age” (Mark Snyder, Joanne M. Miller, Geoffrey Maruyama, Andrew Furco, co-PIs), awarded Fall, 2008.

Office for System Academic Administration, University of Minnesota (\$10,000) for: “Translating Theory and Research on Civic Participation to Create Vibrant Communities for an Urban Age” (Mark Snyder, Joanne M. Miller, Geoffrey Maruyama, Andrew Furco, co-PIs), awarded Fall, 2008.

Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota (\$10,000) for: “An Interdisciplinary Study of Civic Participation” (Joanne M. Miller and Mark Snyder, co-PIs), awarded Spring, 2008.

Best Article Award, awarded in 2007 for the best article published in the *American Review of Public Administration* for the year 2006 for: “Experience, Attitudes, and Willingness to Pay for Police and Fire Protection (with Amy Donohue).

University of Minnesota, McKnight Travel Award (\$1200), 2005

University of Minnesota, Single Semester Leave, 2005

University of Minnesota, Grant-in-Aid (\$34,600), 2004

University of Minnesota, Faculty Summer Research Fellowship (\$5,000), 2004

University of Connecticut, Faculty Grant (\$22,000), 2001

Keynote Presentations

“The Promise and Challenge of Conspiracy Theory Research” to be presented at the Conspiracy Theory Conference (international 2-day conference with over 60 presenters), University of Miami, March 19-22, 2020. *Cancelled because of COVID-19*

“Coping by Conspiracy? Some Puzzles and Unanswered Questions” presented at the COST Comparative Analysis of Conspiracy Theories conference in Prague, Czech Republic, September 19-21, 2019.

Invited Research Presentations at Departments and Small Conferences

“Conspiracy Theories and the Iowa Caucus” invited to present at Stony Brook University, March, 2020. *Cancelled because of COVID-19*

“Conspiracy Theories: Things that Make You (Me) Go Hmmm” presented at the American Politics colloquium series at Rutgers University, February 2020.

“Coping by Conspiracy” presented at the American Politics colloquium series at the University of Pennsylvania, February 2019.

“Why People Believe Conspiracies” presented at the Clarke Forum for Contemporary Issues (the Bruce R. Andrews Lecture), Dickinson College, February 2019.

“Coping by Conspiracy” presented at the Political Methodology colloquium series at Iowa State University, 2018.

“Conspiracy Theories: Who Believes and Why it Matters” presented at the Midterm Election Symposium at Colorado College, 2018.

Roundtable participant, “Facts, Fiction, and Free Media” at the APSA Political Psychology Pre-Conference, Boston, MA, August 29, 2018

“Coping by Conspiracy” presented at the Belief Default Symposium: Implications of the Spinozan Belief Model for Science and Society, hosted by Hamline University, April 19-20 2018.

“The Relationship between Losing an Election and Conspiracy Theory Endorsement” presented at the Post-Truth Politics Conference, hosted by the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies at American University, March 28 2018.

“The Relationship between Losing an Election and Conspiracy Theory Endorsement” at the Political Misperceptions Conference, hosted by the Department of Political Science at the University of Houston, Feb 9-10 2018.

“Coping by Conspiracy” at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill’s American Politics Research Group, Fall 2017

“Coping by Conspiracy” at the Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, Spring 2017

“Blind Beliefs? Conspiracies, Hoaxes, and Disinformation” at the University of Wisconsin-Madison’s Ethics Conference, titled Truth, Trust, and the Future of Journalism, Spring 2017.

“Explaining Political Participation: A Motivational Approach” at the Chicago Area Political and Social Behavior Workshop (CAB), Northwestern University, May 9, 2014.

“Experiments in Messaging: Insights from Psychology” at the Harkin Institute for Public Policy, Iowa State University (Symposium on Campaigns and the 2012 Election), Winter, 2013.

“Explaining Political Participation: A Motivational Approach” at the University of Chicago, Winter, 2012.

“What Motivates Political Participation?” at the Department of Political Science, University of Virginia, Fall, 2010.

“Why do People Participate in Politics?” at the Department of Political Science, University of Nebraska, Spring, 2008.

“Mediators and Moderators of News Media Agenda-Setting and Priming,” at the Department of Communications, University of Texas at Austin, Spring, 2008.

“Why do People Participate in Politics?” at the Department of Political Science, University of Texas at Austin, Fall, 2008.

“New Research on Agenda-Setting,” invited roundtable speaker at the Symposium on Agenda-Setting: Celebrating the 40th Anniversary of the Chapel Hill Study,” University of Texas at Austin, Fall, 2008.

“Bringing Together the Old and the New: Motivations for Political Participation,” at the Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, 2006.

“Framing and Political Participation,” at the Conference on Framing, Texas A&M University, 2005

“Identity Based Feelings, Beliefs, and Actions: How Being Influences Doing” with Wendy Rahn, at the Conference on Social Connectedness and Public Activism, Center for Political Studies, Harvard University, 2002.

“Political Psychology: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Studying Attitudes and Behavior,” Departments of Psychology and Political Science, University of Richmond, 2002

“Threat as a Motivator of Political Activism: A Field Experiment,” at the 2nd Minnesota Symposium on Political Psychology: New Research on the Political Psychology of Campaigns and Elections, Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota, 2000.

“Threats and Opportunities as Motivators of Political Activism,” at the Conference on Political Participation: Building a Research Agenda, Princeton University, 2000.

“Threats and Opportunities as Motivators of Political Activism,” at the Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota, 1999; at the Department of Political Science, Duke University, 1999; at the Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin, 1999; at the Department of Political Science, University of Connecticut, 1999; at the Department of Political Science, University of Oklahoma, 1999; at the Department of Political Science, Binghamton University, 1999; at the Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh, 1998.

“Mediators and Moderators of News Media Priming,” at the Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, 1997.

Pedagogical Presentations

Lecturer, International Society for Political Psychology Summer Academy, July 9-11 2018.

Invited Discussant, Visions in Methodology Conference, May, 2014, McMaster University. (VIM’s mission is to support women who study political methodology. The Conference provides opportunities for scholarly progress, networking, and professional mentoring in research and teaching in order to support women in the political methodology community).

“What are the Limits of Polls?” presented at Views from the U: The Political Science of Election ’08, University of Minnesota, 2008.

“What Motivates Political Participation?” presented to the College in the Schools, University of Minnesota, 2008.

“Mediators and Moderators of News Media Agenda-Setting and Priming,” to the graduate students in JOUR 8001, Studies in Mass Communication I, University of Minnesota, 2005 and 2009.

“WWI and WWII Propaganda,” presented to the College in the Schools, University of Minnesota, 2004.

“The Electoral College,” to the Wayzata/Plymouth League of Women Voters, Golden Valley, Minnesota, 2004.

“Negative Political Advertising,” College in the Schools, University of Minnesota, 2004.

Research Presentations at Conferences

Miller, Joanne M. 2020. “Are Conspiracy Theories for Losers?” 2020. Paper to be presented at the New York Area Political Psychology Meeting, Columbia University, New York. *Cancelled because of COVID-19*

Miller, Joanne M. and Sarah E. Gollust. 2020. “The Antecedents and Consequences of Loser Perceptions in the Domains of Politics, Health Policy, and Economic Policy.” Paper to be presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL. *Cancelled because of COVID-19*

Miller, Joanne M. and David A. M. Peterson. 2020. “Wind Turbines and Vaccines: The Asymmetrical Effect of Donald Trump’s Statements on Belief in Misinformation.” Paper to be

presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
Cancelled because of COVID-19

Miller, Joanne M., Christina E. Farhart, and Kyle L. Saunders. 2020. "Experimentally Manipulating Loser Perceptions: Are Conspiracy Theories for Losers?" Paper to be presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL. *Cancelled because of COVID-19*

Farhart, Christina E., Joanne M. Miller, and Kyle L. Saunders. 2019. "Conspiracy Relief? Learned Helplessness and Conspiratorial Thinking." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M., Christina E. Farhart, and Kyle L. Saunders. 2019. "Are Conspiracy Theories for Losers?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Lisbon, Portugal.

Farhart, Christina E., Joanne M. Miller, and Kyle L. Saunders. 2019. "Conspiracy Relief? Learned Helplessness and Conspiratorial Thinking." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Lisbon, Portugal.

Miller, Joanne M., Christian E. Farhart, and Kyle L. Saunders. 2019. "Why Do People Share Conspiracy Theories." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.

Miller, Joanne M., Christina E. Farhart, and Kyle L. Saunders. 2018. "The Relationship between Losing an Election and Conspiracy Theory Endorsement." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Farhart, Christina E., Kyle L. Saunders, and Joanne M. Miller. 2018. "Are Political Losers More Likely to Believe Conspiracy Theories than Winners?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, San Antonio, TX.

Gollust, Sarah E. and Joanne M. Miller. 2018. "Framing the Opioid Crisis: Do Racial Frames Shape Beliefs of Whites Losing Ground?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA.

Miller, Joanne M., Kyle L. Saunders, and Christina E. Farhart. 2017. "Ideological Asymmetry in Conspiracy Beliefs: The Role of Political Loser Status." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, CA.

Farhart, Christina E., Kyle L. Saunders, and Joanne M. Miller. 2017. "Of Political Losers and Threatened Self-Concepts: The Causes of Ideologically Motivated Belief in Conspiracy Theories." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Edinburgh, Scotland.

Farhart, Christina E., Joanne M. Miller, and Kyle L. Saunders. 2017. "The Relationship Between Perceptions of Loser Status and Conspiracy Theory Endorsement." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Theys, Marissa, Kyle L. Saunders, and Joanne M. Miller. 2017. "I Just Want (and Need) to Believe: The Interaction between Authoritarianism and Ideology in Predicting Conspiracy Theory Endorsement." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Farhart, Christina E., Kyle L. Saunders, and Joanne M. Miller. 2016. "An Experimental Test of the Conspiracy Theories are for Losers Hypothesis." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 1-4, 2016, Philadelphia, PA.

Lavine, Howard, Marti Hope Gonzales, Christopher M. Federico, and Joanne M. Miller. 2016. "The Relationship between Infant Temperament and Adult Political Ideology." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 1-4, 2016, Philadelphia, PA.

Federico, Christopher M., Howard Lavine, Marti Hope Gonzales, and Joanne M. Miller. "Infant Temperament as an Antecedent of Adult Political Preferences." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, July 13-16, 2016, Warsaw, Poland.

Peterson, David A. M., Scott McClurg, Joanne M. Miller, and Kyle L. Saunders. 2016. "The Effect of Election Campaigns on Political Interest" Paper presented at the annual conference of the Canadian Political Science Association, May 31-June 2, Calgary, Canada.

Miller, Joanne M., Kyle L. Saunders, and Christina E. Farhart. 2016. "Are Republicans Really More Prone to Conspiracy Beliefs than Democrats? An Experimental Test of the 'Conspiracy Theories are for Losers' Hypothesis." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 7-10, 2016, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M., Christopher M. Federico, Marti Hope Gonzales, and Howard Lavine. 2016. "Developmental Antecedents of Adult Ideology." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 7-10, 2016, Chicago, IL.

Peterson, David A. M., Kyle L. Saunders, Scott McClurg, and Joanne M. Miller. 2015. "Macrointerest: The Public as Attentive Gods of Vengeance but Lazy Gods of Reward (with

Apologies to V.O. Key).” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, CA. *Recipient, Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior Best Paper Award (2016), presented for the best EPOVB section paper delivered at the previous year’s APSA Annual Meeting.*

Miller, Joanne M., Kyle L. Saunders, and Christina Farhart. 2015. “Motivated Conspiracy Endorsement: A Test of Moderators and Thoughts about Future Research.” Invited to present at the Conference on Conspiracy Theories, University of Miami, March 12-15.

McClurg, Scott, Joanne M. Miller, David A. M. Peterson, and Kyle L. Saunders. 2015. “Political Interest and Polarized Politics.” 2015. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Saunders, Kyle L., Joanne M. Miller, and Christina E. Farhart. 2015. “Conspiracy Endorsement as Motivated Reasoning.” 2015. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M., Kyle L. Saunders, and Christina E. Farhart. 2014. “Conspiracy Endorsement as Motivated Reasoning: The Moderating Roles of Political Knowledge and Trust.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC. *Recipient, Paul Lazarsfeld Award (2015), presented for the best Political Communication paper delivered at the previous year’s APSA Annual Meeting.*

Saunders, Kyle L., Joanne M. Miller, and Christina E. Farhart. 2014. “The Impact of Question Order on the Correlates and Consequences of Conspiratorial Thinking.” Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology, Rome, Italy.

Miller, Joanne M., Kyle L. Saunders, and Christina E. Farhart. 2014. “If You Ask Me If I’m a Birther You Must be Crazy: The Impact of Asking Conspiracy Theory Questions on Data Quality.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. 2013. “From Being to Doing: Why Do People Participate in Politics?” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. 2013. “Roundtable: Lodge and Taber, The Rationalizing Voter.” Invited roundtable at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. 2013. “25 Year Anniversary of *News That Matters*.” Invited roundtable presentation at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. 2012. "Why Do People Participate in Politics? A Tale of Four Identities." Paper was supposed to be presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association (organized panel on the Psychology of Collective Action), but the conference was canceled.

Miller, Joanne M. 2012. "25 Year Anniversary of *News That Matters*." Invited roundtable presentation scheduled for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, but the conference was canceled.

Miller, Joanne M. and Kyle Saunders. 2012. "It's Not All About Resources: The Role of Motivation in Explaining the Instability of Political Participation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Kyle Saunders. 2012. "It's Not All About Resources: The Role of Motivation in Explaining the Instability of Political Participation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Sheagley, Geoffrey, Joanne M. Miller, and Mark Snyder. 2010. "Adapting the Volunteer Functions Inventory to Measure Motives for Political Participation." Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Las Vegas, NV.

Strolovitch, Dara Z., Michael T. Heaney, Joanne M. Miller, and Seth E. Masket. 2010. "Gender Consciousness and Convention Delegates' Evaluations of Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M., Dara Z. Strolovitch, Michael T. Heaney, and Seth E. Masket. 2010. "Profiles in Activism: A Comparison of Protesters and Delegates at the 2008 National Party Conventions." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2010. "Elections and Institutions: Ranked-Choice Voting and Its Attitudinal and Behavioral Effects." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Heaney, Michael T., Joanne M. Miller, Elizabeth Sharrow, Dara Z. Strolovitch, and Seth Masket. 2010. "Gender Consciousness and Convention Delegates' Evaluations of Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Miller, Joanne M. 2010. "Polling and the 2010 Election." (invited). Presented at the annual meeting of the Minnesota Political Science Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Miller, Joanne M. and Sarah Treul. 2009. "Testing the Impact of Resources on the Individual-Level (In)stability of Political Participation Over Time." Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Sept. 3-6, Toronto, Canada.

Masket, Seth E., Michael T. Heaney, Joanne M. Miller, and Dara Z. Strolovitch. 2009. "Networking the Parties: A Comparison of Democratic and Republican National Convention Delegates in 2008" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Sept. 3-6, Toronto, Canada. *Recipient, Best Paper Award, awarded in 2010 for the best paper delivered on a Political Organizations and Parties-sponsored panel at the 2009 APSA annual meeting.*

Heaney, Michael T., Seth Masket, Joanne M. Miller, and Dara Z. Strolovitch. 2009. "Networking the Parties." Paper presented at the State of the Parties conference, October 15-16, Akron, Ohio.

Miller, Joanne M. 2009. "Mediators of Agenda-Setting." 2009. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, Boston, MA.

Miller, Joanne M. and Mark Snyder. 2009. "Using the Volunteer Functions Inventory to Measure Motives for Political Participation." Presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Dublin, Ireland.

Heaney, Michael T., Seth Masket, Joanne M. Miller, and Dara Z. Strolovitch. 2009. "Healing the Rift? Social Networks and Reconciliation between Obama and Clinton Convention Delegates in 2008." Paper presented at the Harvard Political Networks Conference, Harvard University, MA.

Heaney, Michael T., Seth Masket, Joanne M. Miller, and Dara Z. Strolovitch. 2009. "Healing the Rift? Social Networks and Reconciliation between Obama and Clinton Convention Delegates in 2008." Presented at the Midwest Political Science Association meeting, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Mark Snyder. 2009. "Using the Volunteer Functions Inventory to Measure Motives for Political Participation." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M., Dara Z. Strolovitch, Michael T. Heaney, and Seth Masket. 2009. "A Tale of Two Cities: Protesters and Observers at the 2008 National Party Conventions." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. 2008. "Polling and the 2008 Election." (invited). Presented at the annual meeting of the Minnesota Political Science Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Miller, Joanne M. 2008. "Why Do People Participate in Politics?" Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Vecera, Vincent, Joanne M. Miller, and George E. Marcus. 2008. "Conceptualizing Motivation." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. 2006. "Elections and Polling." Presented at the annual meeting of the Minnesota Political Science Association, St. Paul, MN.

Miller, Joanne M. 2006. "What Motivates Political Participation: An Experimental Test." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M., Lawrence Jacobs, Samuel J. Best, and Chase Harrison. 2005. "The Turnout We Make: Assessing the Predictive Validity of Measures of Likely Turnout." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Miami, FL.

Miller, Joanne M. 2005. "Why do Individuals Participate in Politics?" Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. 2004. "What Motivates Political Participation?" Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Adams, Dana Raye Buckley and Joanne M. Miller. 2004. "Does Media Sensationalism Affect Ability to Learn from News?" Presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Lund, Sweden.

Miller, Joanne M. 2004. "Media Agenda-Setting: Does Content Matter?" Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Wedeking, Justin P. and Joanne M. Miller. 2004. "Measuring Public Opinion: Examining the Impact of the Refusal Conversions and Callbacks on Data Quality." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Justin Wedeking. 2003. "The Impact of Refusal Conversions and Callbacks on Data Quality." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Nashville, TN.

Flanigan, William H., Joanne M. Miller, Jennifer L. Williams, and Nancy H. Zingale. 2003. "The Television Campaign in the 2002 Minnesota Senate Race." Presented at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Denver, CO.

Peterson, David and Joanne M. Miller. 2003. "What is Attitude Strength? Theoretical and Empirical Implications of Various Measures of Attitude Strength." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 2003. "What Motivates Issue Public Membership? Distinguishing Between Personal and National Importance." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Miller, Joanne M. and Wendy Rahn. 2002. "Identity-Based Feelings, Beliefs and Actions: How Being Influences Doing." Presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Berlin, Germany.

Miller, Joanne M. and Amy K. Donahue. 2002. "Media Exposure and Citizen Attitudes about the Police." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 2002. "Mediators and Moderators of News Media Agenda-Setting." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Donahue, Amy K. and Joanne M. Miller. 2002. "The Media, Citizen Preferences, and Paying for Public Safety." Presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Budgeting and Financial Management, Washington, D.C.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 2001. "What Motivates Political Cognition and Behavior?" Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Donahue, Amy K. and Joanne M. Miller. 2001. "Help! Call 911: Experience, Attitudes, and Willingness to Pay for Police and Fire Protection." Presented at the annual meeting of the Western Social Science Association, Reno, Nevada.

Krosnick, Jon A. and Joanne M. Miller. 2000. "Attitude Change Outside the Laboratory: News Media "Priming" Turns Out Not to be Priming After All." Presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1999. "The Impact of Threats and Opportunities on Political Participation." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Neuman, W. Russell, Michael B. MacKuen, George F. Marcus, and Joanne M. Miller. 1997. "Affective Choice and Rational Choice." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Miller, Joanne M., Jennifer L. Welbourne, and Robert M. Arkin. 1997. "The Phenomenology of Overachievement: Effects of Type and Nature of Feedback." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, Washington, D.C.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1997. "The Impact of Policy Change Threat on Issue Public Membership." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1996. "Can Issue Public Membership be Triggered by the Threat of a Policy Change?" Presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1996. "The Roles of Personal Importance and National Importance in Motivating Issue Public Membership." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Welbourne, Jennifer L., Joanne M. Miller, and Robert M. Arkin. 1995. "The Phenomenology and Behavioral Outcomes of Overachievement." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, New York, NY.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1995. "Mediators and Moderators of News Media Priming: It Ain't Accessibility, Folks." Presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Washington, D.C.

Miller, Joanne M., Leandre Fabrigar, and Jon A. Krosnick. 1995. "Contrasting Attitude Importance and Collective Issue Importance: Attitude Properties and Consequences." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1995. "Ballot Order Effects on Election Outcomes." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1994. "Does Accessibility Mediate Agenda-setting and Priming?" Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. 1993. "The Effects of Candidate Ballot Order on Election Outcomes." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Media Coverage of my Research

Media coverage of my conspiracy theory research:

Washington Post, Huffington Post, Vox, City Pages, The Atlantic, Salon, The New York Times, National Public Radio, Minnesota Public Radio, The LA Times, New Scientist

Media coverage and media appearances regarding my conspiracy theory research:

Fox 32 Chicago, Good Day Chicago, Live television interview; May 27; 2020.

https://www.huffpost.com/entry/psychology-why-people-believe-coronavirus-conspiracy-theories_1_5ec46c59c5b6956f4169cea4

<https://www.pix11.com/news/coronavirus/beware-of-covid-19-conspiracy-theories>

Global News Radio 980 CFPL in London, ON, Canada. Live radio interview; April 30, 2020.

<http://www.downtownwithrichkimball.com/2020/05/13/dr-joanne-miller-5-13-20/>

<https://www.businessinsider.sg/how-to-push-back-when-your-family-talks-conspiracy-theories-2020-5>

<https://www.salon.com/2020/05/12/why-some-conspiracy-theorists-believe-bill-gates-is-behind-the-coronavirus/>

<https://www.vox.com/2020/4/28/21231869/coronavirus-anxiety-politics-partisanship-research>

<https://www.usnews.com/news/health-news/articles/2020-04-23/coronavirus-conspiracy-theories-abound-and-they-could-cause-real-harm>

[NewsThink Podcast, Why People Believe Conspiracy Theories, May 2 2020](#)

Radio FM4 Reality Check Podcast, Feb. 11, 2020 <https://fm4.orf.at/stories/2998525/>

Direction Democracy Podcast Guest Host (Delaware Public Radio; October 25, 2019):
<https://www.delawarepublic.org/post/direction-democracy-podcast-navigating-political-conspiracy-theories>

[Lovett or Leave It Podcast, April 14, 2018 https://crooked.com/podcast/shooting-star-stupid/](https://crooked.com/podcast/shooting-star-stupid/)

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/12/08/why-smart-people-believe-all-the-crazy-things-trump-says/>

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/conspiracy-theorists-politics_565e0c14e4b072e9d1c3b2e9?a8zlr6r

<http://www.vox.com/2015/12/10/9886222/conspiracy-theories-right-wing>

<http://www.citypages.com/news/why-well-read-conservatives-fall-for-conspiracy-theories-7894425>

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/01/15/donald-trump-has-a-brand-new-conspiracy-theory/?postshare=9301452877627662&tid=ss_fb-bottom

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/01/08/why-so-many-americans-think-the-government-wants-their-guns/>

<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/02/the-limits-of-donald-trumps-accusations/459783/>

http://www.salon.com/2016/03/19/conspiracy_theories_are_for_losers_science_explains_why_conservatives_see_sneaky_cabals_in_every_defeat/

<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/19/upshot/donald-trump-and-conspiracy-theories-what-a-poll-in-2011-signaled.html>

http://www.npr.org/2016/09/03/492241250/the-clinton-health-rumors-arent-going-away-anytime-soon-heres-why?utm_campaign=storyshare&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_medium=social

<https://www.mprnews.org/story/2016/09/03/clinton-health-conspiracy>

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/donald-trump-birther-poll_us_57e12c21e4b04a1497b68044

<http://www.latimes.com/science/sciencenow/la-sci-sn-trump-conspiracy-theories-20161103-story.html>

<http://journalistsresource.org/studies/politics/polarization/conspiracy-theories-conservatives-liberals-knowledge-trust>

<https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg23231020-500-changing-minds-how-to-trump-delusion-and-restore-the-power-of-facts/>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/15/upshot/why-more-democrats-are-now-embracing-conspiracy-theories.html?smid=fb-share>

https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2017/03/07/democracy-requires-trust-but-trump-is-making-us-all-into-conspiracy-theorists/?tid=ss_tw-bottom&utm_term=.f60fdc967164

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/posteverything/wp/2018/05/15/theorizing-about-the-trump-administration-has-become-our-national-pastime/?utm_term=.b717b12c9376

<https://psmag.com/news/how-to-tackle-conspiracy-theories-in-politics>

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/aug/14/conspiracy-theories-misconceptions-rampant-politics>

<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=vliD1ypnsWo> (Huffington Post, Between the Lines)

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/11/15/donald-trump-pushes-conspiracy-theories-florida-recount/1991767002/>

Media coverage of previous research:

Associated Press, Washington Post, USA Today, LA Times, Star Tribune, Pioneer Press, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, Minnesota Public Radio, Inside Higher Education

Court Cases Citing my Research

Jacobson v. Lee (2019), 4:18cv262-MW/CAS (US District Court Northern District of Florida Tallahassee Division)

Akins v. Secretary of State, 904 A.2d 702 (N.H. 2006)

Bradley v. Perrodin (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 1153

TEACHING

Graduate Courses

Political Psychology and Socialization
Survey Research Methods
Proseminar in Political Psychology
Questionnaire Design (7-week course)

Survey Sampling Methods (7-week course)

Graduate Advising

Comprehensive Exam Committee member, University of Minnesota: Wen Bu (Psychology), Christina Farhart, Brianna Smith, Emily Baer-Bositis, Amanda Bryan, Maron Sorenson, Phil Chen, Justin Holmes, Monica Schneider, Angela Bos, Jon Peterson, Melanie Burns, Justin Wedeking, Dominique Walsh, Chris Galdieri, Dana Adams, Matt Cravens, Caitlin Dwyer, Geoffrey Sheagley, Emily Fisher (Psychology), Grace Deason (Psychology), Chris Miller (Psychology), Neil Bendle (Business Administration)

Dissertation Advisor, University of Minnesota: CURRENT: Penny Thomas (Political Science). PAST: Jennifer Halen (Political Science), Michelle Chen (co-advisor, School of Journalism and Mass Communication), Matt Motta (Political Science), Christina Farhart (Political Science), Elizabeth Householder ((co-advisor) School of Journalism and Mass Communication), Geoffrey Sheagley (Political Science), Matt Cravens ((co-advisor) Political Science), Kjersten Nelson ((co-advisor), Political Science)

Dissertation Committee member, University of Delaware: CURRENT: Anna Nuzzolese (Political Science).

Dissertation Committee member, University of Minnesota: CURRENT: Wen Bu (Psychology, UMN). PAST: Pierce Ekstrom (Psychology UMN), Brianna Smith (Political Science UMN), Amanda Bryan (Political Science UMN), Maron Sorenson (Political Science UMN), Phil Chen (Political Science UMN), Justin Holmes (Political Science UMN), Chris Galdieiri (Political Science UMN), Justin Wedeking (Political Science UMN), Angela Bos (Political Science UMN), Jon Peterson (Political Science UMN), Eve Ringsmuth (Political Science UMN), Melanie Burns (Political Science UMN), David Lake (Psychology UMN), Neil Bendle (Business Administration UMN), Emily Fisher (Psychology UMN), Grace Deason (Psychology UMN), Chris Miller (Psychology UMN)

Masters Committee member, University of Minnesota: Moira Fredrickson (Mass Communication UMN), Holiday Shapiro (Political Science UMN), Margaret Kunde (Communication Studies UMN), Caitlin Massert (Mass Communication UMN)

Undergraduate Courses

Politics and the Media
Conspiracies, Rumors, and Misinformation
Political Persuasion and Propaganda
Public Opinion
Political Psychology of Mass Behavior
Quantitative Analysis in Political Science

Undergraduate Advising

List of senior paper, honors theses, and independent research advising available upon request.

SERVICE

Service to the Discipline

Elected/Appointed Office, Professional Organizations

Vice President (Publications), International Society of Political Psychology, 2020-2023

Chair, Nominations Committee, Midwest Political Science Association, 2019-2020

Pre-Conference Organizer, APSA Political Psychology Section, 2019-2020 (elected)

Co-Organizer, APSA Political Psychology Pre-conference, 2017-2019

Program Section Chair, Public Opinion, for the 2016 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association

Program Co-Director, 2014 Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology

Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, American Political Science Association, 2013-2016

Governing Council Member, American Political Science Association, 2012-2014 (appointed)

Governing Council Member, International Society of Political Psychology, 2011-2014 (elected)

Annual Meeting Section Chair, Political Decision Making, for the 2010 Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology (co-chair with Chris Federico and Paul Goren)

Editorial Positions

Associate Principal Investigator, Time-Sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS), (2009–2019).

Editorial Board, *Political Science Research and Methods*

Editorial Board, *Social Sciences Quarterly*

Editorial Board, *Advances in Political Psychology* (term ended Dec. 2018)

Editorial Board, *Political Behavior* (Jan. 2015 – Dec. 2018)

Editorial Board, *PS: Political Science & Politics* (Jan. 2016 –Dec. 2018)

Organized Symposia and Conferences

American Political Science Association Political Psychology Pre-Conference, 2019 (co-organizing with Cara Wong and Dan Hopkins and sponsored by the APSA Political Psychology section)

American Political Science Association Political Psychology Pre-Conference, 2018 (co-organizing with Cara Wong and Leonie Huddy and sponsored by the APSA Political Psychology section and the International Society of Political Psychology)

American Political Science Association Political Psychology Pre-Conference, 2017 (co-organized with Cara Wong and Leonie Huddy and sponsored by the APSA Political Psychology section and the International Society of Political Psychology)

The Political Psychology of the 2016 Election (2016, co-organized with Paul Goren and sponsored by the Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota)

The Political Psychology of Protest and Collective Action (2012, co-organized with Christopher Federico and sponsored by the Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota)

The Psychology of Political Misinformation (2011, co-organized with Christopher Federico and sponsored by the Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota).

Second Minnesota Symposium on Political Psychology, Campaigns and Elections (2002; co-organized with Jamie Druckman)

Advisory Panel and Conference Committees

National Science Foundation Political Science Advisory Panel, Political Science Directorate, 2009-2011

National Science Foundation Advisory Panel, Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) program, June 2010

American Association for Public Opinion Research (2002-2007)

Prize Committees

The Westview **Press** Award for the best paper by delivered by a graduate student at the 2013 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

Best Political Psychology paper presented at the 2011 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association

The Robert E. Lane Award for the best book in political psychology published in 2008

Best Political Psychology paper presented at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association

Reviewer

Princeton University Press, *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, *Political Behavior*, *British Journal of Political Science*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *Perspectives on Politics*, National Science Foundation, TESS (Time-Sharing Experiments in the Social Sciences), *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Mass Communication and Society Political Psychology*, *American Politics Quarterly*, *Research and Politics*, *Political Science Research and Methods*, *Psychological Bulletin*, *Psychological Science*, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *Climatic Change*, *Social Sciences Quarterly*, *Political Communication*, *British Journal of Social Psychology*

Professional Affiliations

American Political Science Association; Midwest Political Science Association; International Society of Political Psychology

Service to the University of Delaware

Director of Admissions, Department of Political Science & International Relations (2019-2020)

Executive Committee, Department of Political Science & International Relations (2019-2020)

Planning Committee, Department of Political Science & International Relations (2019-2020)

Admissions Committee, Department of Political Science & International Relations (2019)

Service to the University of Minnesota

Director of the Center for the Study of Political Psychology (2011-2014)

Advisory Board Member, Center for the Study of Political Psychology (2001-2018)

Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Political Science (2007-2010)

Director of Graduate Studies, Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Minor in Political Psychology (2005-2008)

Admissions Director, Department of Political Science (2011-2012)

Department Placement Director (2016-2018)

American Politics Field Chair (2004-2006, 2013-2016)

Graduate Work Committee (2004-2005, 2013-2014, 2016-2017)

Department of Political Science Job Search Committee (2002-2003, 2009-2010, 2014-2015)

Research Mentor, College of Liberal Arts Minority Student Research Opportunities Program
Summer 2013, Lulete Mola)

Research Mentor, Advanced Research Program (for Christina Raymond, Plainedge High School,
North Massapequa, NY; (2010, full year)

Research Mentor, College of Liberal Arts Freshman Research Award Program (Spring 2012,
Joshua Quinn; Spring 2009, Michael Berger)

Elected to the College of Liberal Arts Assembly (2011-2013)

Appointed to the Curriculum, Instruction, and Advising Committee of the College of Liberal
Arts Assembly (2011-2013)

Planning Committee Member for Spring 2012 Graduate and Professional Education Assembly on Graduate Advising (2012)

Department Representative, Graduate School's Ph.D. Completion Project (2007-2010)

Member, Graduate School's Social Science P&R Council Subcommittee (Course and Program Review; 2009-2010)

College of Liberal Arts Course Review Committee (2003-2005)

College of Liberal Arts Advisory Committee for the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (2006-2007)

Network of Interdisciplinary Initiatives, member of Interdisciplinary Research Centers Working Group (2008-2010)

Last revised: June 20, 2020